Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/848,121	KRALL ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Kennedy Schaetzle	3762
All Participants:	Status of Application	n: <u>Allowed</u>
(1) Kennedy Schaetzle.	(3)	
(2) Wayne House.	(4)	
Date of Interview: <u>31 August 2005</u>	Time: <u>12:30 PM</u>	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes If Yes, provide a brief description:	Applicant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: N/A		
Claims discussed: 1, 8, 22, 29, 42, 44		
Prior art documents discussed: Hoffmann et al. 5,902,329; Shapland et al. 5,807,306; Kro	otz et al. 2005/0164283	
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE Continuation Sheet	GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT	WAS DISCUSSED:
Part III.		•
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a sep directly resulted in the allowance of the application of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a sep did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief su 	on. The examiner will provide a varate record of the substance of	written summary of the substance of the interview, since the interview
(Everyings/CDE Cignoture) /A-	oplicant/Applicant's Representat	ivo Signaturo if appropriato)
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Ap	phicanivaphicants representat	ive orginature – ir appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The porosity of polymer hydrogels was discussed, with the examiner bringing the Shapland and Krotz references to the applicants' attention to show that hydrogels are porous and thus that the Hoffmann et al. reference would read on the applicants' independent claims. The examiner suggested incorporating the subject matter of claim 8 into claim 1 to avoid an art rejection based on Hoffmann et al. Applicant agreed to make the change and pursue the original subject matter in a continuation application..